



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 13, 2011

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Chair Sperling called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Azumbrado, Giacomini, Green, Liccardo, Mackenzie, and Mullin. Commission Chair Tissier and Vice Chair Rein-Worth were present in their ex-officio voting member capacity. Other Commissioners present as ad hoc members of the Committee were Bates, Dodd, Kinsey, Wiener and Sartipi.

ABAG Administrative Committee members in attendance were: Green, Avalos, Cortese, Gibson, Gingles, Gioia, Haggerty, Liccardo, Luce, Pierce, and Sperling.

CONSENT CALENDAR: a) Minutes of April 8, 2011

Commissioner Mackenzie moved approval of the Consent Calendar, Commissioner Rien-Worth seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

PLAN BY AREA: a) Commission Workshop Discussion Summary

Mr. Doug Kimsey summarized the Commission Workshop discussion, which was held on April 27 – 28, 2011. The discussion was focused on four main issues: 1) Reviewing local reaction to the Initial Vision Scenario (IVS), 2) Moving forward from the IVS addressing trade-offs that can get us to our adopted targets; 3) Understanding how the Plan Bay Area might help develop a regional economic development strategy, and 4) Discussing items on how transportation funds can be used to support desired land uses.

Mr. Kimsey pointed out that after reviewing the Commissioner comments, there were some constant themes that emerged: 1) support for using transportation dollars to support desired land uses, particularly incentivizing and removing impediments to providing more workforce housing; 2) diverse regional needs in urban, suburban, and rural settings need to be considered as staff set funding priorities; and 3) ensure that land use planning leads the implementation, and in order to do that monitoring progress will be an essential work task. He noted that staff will keep these themes in mind and other themes heard in the polling as they move into the alternatives analysis phase.

Mr. Jon Canapery, from Corey, Canapery, & Galanis Research, presented a summary of key findings from the three public opinion surveys: 1) Plan Bay Area outreach poll; 2) MTC “Baseline Climate Initiatives Survey”; and 3) MTC “Transit-Oriented Development – New Movers Survey”. He noted that detailed cross-tabs and a full report of the Plan Bay Area survey will be available in June 2011. He closed by noting

that there are opportunities to change how people travel and live to reduce emissions, and Bay Area residents can be motivated by altruistic concerns about the environment, public health, and preserving the Bay Area for future generations.

Committee comments:

- Commissioner Green commented on the housing trade-offs, and noted that the statement “I would accept a longer commute to live in a larger house” should say, “I would accept a longer commute to live in a larger house which also costs less”. This modification would produce different results.
- Commissioner Sperling also noted that the statement “I would be willing to accept an increase in the number of homes and traffic in my community, if it helped protect open space and air quality in the Bay Area” reinforces the urban/suburban/rural strategy – i.e., that Bay Area residents think it’s important to preserve agricultural lands and open space, as done in Napa County.
- Councilmember Pierce stated that the answers seem to be driven by the way the questions were posed.
- Commissioner Mullin commented on the top transportation priorities, and noted that extending commuter rail line such as BART and Caltrain ranked fairly high.
- Commissioner Liccardo agrees with Commissioner Green on the housing trade-offs, and noted that you may see different results when you factor in schools, crime, etc.
- Commissioner Wiener commented on the popularity of travel modes where it notes that 33% had taken the train, and 23% rode the bus, and asked what the overlap is? Response: They are not mutually exclusive.
- Commissioner Bates stated that people are paying the price to live in communities where they can walk to services, and have good transportation systems.
- Commissioner Mackenzie stated that staff needs to implement the sustainable community strategy to actually bring about reduction in VMT.
- Commissioner Tissier commented on senior mobility and noted that people are now more likely to sell their home to move where there are greater mobility options.
- Commissioner Halsted stated that real estate prices tend to be more stable in central urban areas than in suburban areas.
- Supervisor Gioia would like to see the survey results by county.

b) Defining Alternative Scenario

Ms. Ashley Nguyen introduced the alternative scenarios presentation, noting that the recent analytic work on the Current Regional Plans and Initial Vision Scenario showed that while these scenarios achieved the adopted 2020 greenhouse gas emission reduction target, both scenarios still far short of the 2035 gas emission reduction target and other adopted performance targets. Moving forward, Ms. Nguyen said that the key objective of this second round of scenario planning is to identify and test scenarios that demonstrate how we can achieve our greenhouse gas and other performance targets.

Mr. Ken Kirkey identified a number of policy issues that have emerged: 1) Are we really doing everything possible to move toward a more sustainable land use development pattern in the region?; 2) Can we afford the transportation improvements needed to support the pattern?; 3) What difference would employment distribution make?; and 4) Can we develop distinct alternative scenarios that help us evaluate these questions. He stated that staff has received

significant input from various policy groups and public workshops that have been held throughout the region, and briefly highlighted those points. He summarized the alternatives scenarios framework.

Ms. Nguyen outlined three transportation options: 1) Transportation 2035 Investment Strategy; 2) Intensive Transit Services, and 3) Transit Expansion and Roadway Improvements. She also highlighted five policy initiatives, which are similar to the initiatives that staff tested early on as part of the greenhouse gas target-setting process before the Air Resources Board. Ms. Nguyen explained that land use, transportation and policy variables can be mixed and matched for each scenario. Ms. Nguyen closed with a summary of the alternative scenario timeline, noting that staff will bring back the scenarios for review and approval by the joint committee in June/July and will initiate the analysis thereafter.

Committee comments:

- Commissioner Green stated that the “mixed/matched” scenario examples should focus on achieving the greenhouse gas reduction targets.
- Commissioner Bates stated SB310 gives us opportunities – if you develop in the priority areas, you will be able to keep the tax increment funding.
- Councilmember Rein-Worth asked if these scenarios will be tested against the unconstrained numbers as shown in the Initial Vision Scenario. She also asked if growth scenarios exclude development beyond urban limit lines and moving growth closer within the urban footprint? Or, will we assume some growth beyond the urban footprint? Response: The Sustainable Community Strategy will include a forecast that is constrained as well as a scenario that shows where the region would like to be and what might be able to be put into place. The scenarios would be testing different ways to distribute growth, including moving growth closer to the urban core and some dispersed growth.
- Commissioner Mullin asked how staff will factor in job growth into this formula. Response: Staff is trying to understand the importance of employment location. Staff will want to test 1) what happens with employment if its heavily located near transit – what does it do for the performance targets, 2) if it’s located in the outer parts of the region – what does that look like, can that happen and to what extent.
- Councilmember Pierce commented on the basic assumptions for projections and asked how we are coordinating our interregional forecasting with San Joaquin County. She also commented on the assumptions that go into the forecast; she questioned the growth assumptions in the forecast.
- Commissioner Liccardo stated the market is going to determine where jobs will be located, and the most we can do is to constrain where housing will go. He added that we have limited resources to expand roadways and transit beyond what’s in the Regional Transportation Plan, so we should not be focusing attention there. Rather than talk about where jobs ought to go, staff should refocus on where transit exists now, note that we don’t have the resources now to maintain our roads and transit well, and direct our focus on what we have the most control over, which is housing.
- Commissioner Dodd stated that housing incentive policy tested in Napa County has a lot of merit, and suggested that it could be replicated at a regional scale.
- Supervisor Gioia noted that getting a jobs/housing balance is challenging because people frequently change their jobs.

- Commissioner Sperling asked that staff prepare an analysis that identifies what policies we can control, what we can't control, and what does it take to affect change. He noted there should be an analysis that shows that we're adopting the most policies to meet our objectives.

OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jeff Hobson, TransForm, commented that he likes the idea of mixing and matching various factors to create the scenarios. He also stated that staff needs to make sure that the forecast models accurately reflect scenario results.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, June 10, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.

J:\COMMITTEE\Planning Committee\2011\June11\2a_Final_minutes.doc